

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed April 27, 2007, the Examiner noted that claims 1-16 were pending, claims 8-10, 15 and 16 were subject to restriction and/or election requirement, and rejected claims 1-7 and 11-14. Claims 8-10, and 15-16 have been withdrawn. Claims 17 and 18 are new. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-7, and 11-14 have been amended. Thus, in view of the forgoing claims 1-7, 11-14 and 17-18 remain pending for reconsideration which is requested. The Examiner's rejections are traversed below.

On pages 2-6 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1-7 and 11-14 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Nyman et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,089,298). The Nyman reference is directed towards resolving device name conflicts when adding devices to existing ad hoc networks or when joining two ad hoc networks together. See Nyman Abstract.

On pages 3-5 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 6 and 11-14 citing to Fig. 1 of Nyman as teaching "a storage part that stores the identification information." Applicants respectfully disagree and submit that in Nyman, a device address associated with a user name is not necessarily stored in a name storage unit. Applicants submit that in Nyman, if there is a plurality of the same names, a device address associated with a user name is not stored in a name storage unit.

On page 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 7 citing to Fig. 1 of Nyman as teaching "a communication device using proper address information which specifies an interface of devices of the other party..." Applicants respectfully disagree and submit that the "proper address information" claimed in claim 7 is patentably distinguishable from the "device address" of Nyman. Applicants submit that a device address in a wireless network, as suggested in Nyman, can be assigned to a first device and later reassigned to a second device when the first device is no longer logged in to the network, resulting in the device address not being a "proper" device identifier as such, since the device address could potentially refer to multiple devices temporally. In contrast, claim 7 states "proper address information" to uniquely identify only one device.

With respect to claim 1, on page 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner stated that Nyman in Fig. 1 suggests "an information processing part that stores the pieces of identification information concerning the device of the other party in said storage part, retrieves the identification information from said storage part by receiving input of specifying information out of said pieces of identification information, and relates a result of that retrieval to said specifying

information and outputs them, or makes that output possible.” Fig. 1 of Nyman indicates an ad hoc wireless network that lists a name or alternate name input by a user that is associated with a device address of the user for one wireless device. In contrast, Nyman does not suggest that other devices for a particular name, other than one wireless device, will be listed and available for selection. In contrast, claim 1 has been amended to recite in relevant part: “a receiver receiving a plurality of pieces of identification information concerning the devices of the other party;” (Claim 1, lines 3-4) and “an information processor ... making that output possible in order to identify and specify a particular device of the other party.” (Claim 1, lines 6-7 and 10-11). Support for this amendment can be found in the Specification in paras. [0057] and [0074].

Nothing in the Nyman reference teaches or suggests these features of the application; thus, applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over the prior art. Claims 2 and 3 depend directly and indirectly from claim 1 and include all the features of claim 1 plus additional features not taught or suggested by the prior art. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-3 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art, and favorable reconsideration of the claims 1-3 is respectfully requested.

Claims 4-7 and 11-14 have been amended also to emphasize “a particular device of the other party” or “devices of the other party.” Therefore, applicants respectfully submit that claims 4-7 and 11-14 are patentably distinguishable over the prior art and favorable reconsideration of claims 4-7 and 11-14 is respectfully requested.

New claims 17 and 18 also include the feature “devices of the other party.” Thus, for the reasons above, applicant respectfully submits that new claims 17 and 18 patentably distinguish over the prior art.

New claim 17 also features “identification information including name information of device assigned by a manufacturer or a user.” Support for this feature can be found in the Specification at para. [0075]. Nothing in the cited art teaches or suggests this feature, and no new matter has been added.

New claim 18 features “device name information being assigned by a manufacturer or a user.” Support for this feature can be found in the Specification in paras. [0046]-[0055] and [0075]. Nothing in the cited art teaches or suggests this feature, and no new matter has been added.

Thus, applicants respectfully submit that claims 17 and 18 are in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration of claims 17 and 18 is respectfully requested.

It is submitted that claims 1-7, 11-14 and 17-18 continue to be allowable. It is further submitted that the claims are not taught, disclosed or suggested by the prior art. The claims are therefore in a condition suitable for allowance. An early Notice of Allowance is requested.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: August 27, 2007

By: /J. Randall Beckers/
J. Randall Beckers
Registration No. 30,358

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501